Application No. Applicant(s) 09/867.565 YAMANE, TAKESHI Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee 1714 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee. (2) MR. Daniel Geselowitz. PhD: Date of Interview: 22 September 2003. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: pending claims. Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) ⋈ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed was the 112 1st paragraph new matter issue, where the hardener was recited as part of the binder system. The applicant's representative agreed to make thermosetting resin and hardener as two separate components, in which situation the specification would provide support. Discussed were also examples 5-8 and 11. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if(required